"George A. Beitel" <gus@srv.net> on 10/02/2001 09:24:34 AM

To: YMP_SR@ymp.gov
cc:

Subject: Comment: A Possible Site Recommendation for Yucca Mountain

Part of Records Package / Supplement / Correction

To: Carol Hanlon

Attached is a 1 page comment on the Site Recommendation in WORD format.
If you are for some reason unable to read the attachment, please notify me so that I can provide it in an alternative format.
Thank You.

- Comment on Yucca Mtn Site Selection.doc

George A. Beitel
208-522-9849

1

YMP_SR@ymp.gov

October 2, 2001

OCT 9 - 2001

Carol Hanlon
U.S. Department of Energy
Yucca Mountain Site Characterization Office, (M/S #025)
P.O. Box 30307
North Las Vegas, Nevada 89036–0307

Subject: Comment: **A Possible Site Recommendation for Yucca Mountain**

The science community has been advocating disposal of high-level radioactive wastes in deep geologic repositories since the early 1960's. Most studies have quickly focused on desert environments such as exist in Nevada. Water is the primary motive vehicle with the potential to move the radionuclides to the accessible biosphere. The absence of significant quantities of water now and anticipated in the next 10,000 years makes the Yucca Mountain Site particularly appealing.

I have read much of the Science and Engineering Report on Yucca Mountain and strongly agree with the design and scientific studies. My own credentials are: PhD Physicist, 27-year career in nuclear waste management and nuclear materials. For the past 10 years I have taught courses on the treatment of radioactive waste at the Idaho State University.

In 1972, while employed with Midwest Research Institute in Kansas City, Missouri, I coauthored a proposal to study the potential for sabotage of nuclear waste storage or disposal sites. The concern for sabotage of near-surface storage was of concern then and is of even more concern today. Only deep geologic disposal will ensure that no advantage exists for potential saboteurs. There are many anti-nuclear advocates that prefer to do nothing. Doing nothing leaves the current high-level waste and spent fuel inventories stored in near-surface storage. It is time now to move this material to a safer configuration, one that will be provided by a deep geologic repository.

Whereas other repository locations could also be demonstrated as safe (Salt, Basalt, Granite, for example, all of which have been considered), my vote goes to Yucca Mountain as the first choice. My vote is based on:

1. Extremely dry climate
2. High integrity tuff formation
3. Distance from population centers
4. Minimal demonstrated local valuable mineral deposits
5. High ion-capture capacity (sorption capacity) of the zeolitic tuff formation.

Let us move ahead and do what we have known was an intelligent decision for 30 years.

Sincerely yours,
George A. Beitel, Ph. D.

Note: I am employed full time with BBWI the M&O Contractor at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, and hold Adjunct Professor positions with both the Idaho State University (Engineering Department) and the University of Idaho (Civil Engineering Department). I work as a Systems Engineer, and have not worked for High-level Waste, Spent Fuel, or Repository Programs in the past 14 years.

2